

REMARKS

Applicant submits that the Office Actions and Advisory Action issued in this application have failed to show the elements of the claims. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that the Applicant has failed to differentiate coils and exciters. Applicant strongly traverses this incorrect statement. Applicant has repeatedly shown the differences between coils and exciters, and in fact the claims as amended and the arguments in the response to final office action clearly make the distinction. Coils are multiple windings with long wires. Exciters are a short helical winding. Further, the Examiner has never shown any coil that has electricity passing through its core. This is because coils do not pass electricity through the core. The short helical winding of the present claims is not a coil. It does not function as a coil, and it does not have the structure of a coil.

Still further, Applicant submits that it has shown with clarity and completeness the differences, and the Examiner has not shown a prima facie case for the incorrect arguments that have been presented. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections, full consideration of the comments and amendments, and a complete search, so that this matter can be brought to a fair and complete result.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, and the remarks and amendments in the response to final office action, Applicant believes that all pending claims as amended are facially in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections and rejections, and for a Notice of Allowance to be issued in this case.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2203.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 May 2006



Daniel J. Polglaze
Reg. No. 39,801

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T 612 312-2200
F 612 312-2250